

To Those on Attached List

SUBJECT: SUBMISSION OF *IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE FOR THE
TECHNICAL PEER REVIEW PROCESS* VERSION 3.0

Enclosed is version 3.0 of the *Implementation Guidance for the Technical Peer Review Process*. The changes from the first two versions came from the lessons learned since the external peer review was implemented. The technical core criteria have been expanded allowing you, the decision maker, to use the results of the review as a powerful tool. Recognizing the importance of timing we are proposing a new schedule so that the results of the peer review would be available to you at the beginning of the fourth quarter, in time for your decision to continue or discontinue the technology development activity.

For your convenience, attached is a list highlighting some of the major changes from the previous revisions of the *Implementation Guidance*. In several weeks, a video tape complimenting this guidance document, will be made available to you, the Program Managers, your Product Line Managers, and Principal Investigators. The purpose of this videotape is to walk you through the policy involved and the implementation procedures associated with the peer review process.

I look forward once again to another productive year of peer review activities. Should you have any comments or questions regarding this guidance document, please feel free to call me at (630) 252-2503, or Miles Dionisio, my Deputy, at (630) 252-2499.

Alvin L. Young, Director
Center for Risk Excellence and
EM-50 Peer Review Coordinator

Enclosure:
As Stated

Distribution w/encl.:

Gerald Boyd, EM-50, FORS
John Lehr, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Jef Walker, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
John Lankford, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Tom Anderson, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Mark Gilbertson, EM-52, FORS
T. Chee, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf (20 copies)
Michael Barainca, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Kurt Gerdes, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
G. Chamberlain, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Jaffer Mohiuddin, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Jerry Hyde, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
John DeGregory, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Charles Nalezny, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Daniel Lillian, EM-50, GTN-Clvrf
Theodore Pietrok, DOE-RL
Billie Mauss, DOE-RL
James Wright, DOE-SR
Thomas Hicks, DOE-SR
John Geiger, DOE-SR
Scott McMullin, DOE-SR
Elizabeth Phillips, DOE-OR, (10 copies)
Bill Owca, DOE-ID

Linda Petersen, DOE-ID
Ken Osborne, DOE-ID
Gary F. Polansky, SNL
Paul Hart, DOE-FETC
Steve Bossart, DOE-FETC
Maria Vargas, DOE-FETC
James Duda, DOE-FETC
Robert Beddick, DOE-FETC
Brian Frankhouser, DOE-FETC
Joe Paladino, DOE-FETC
Linton Yarbrough, DOE-AL
Joseph Ginanni, DOE-NV
John Jones, DOE-NV
Jerry Harness, DOE-OR
Melvin Schupe, WETO
Patrick Trudel, DOE-ID
Alan Moghissi, RSI (60 copies)
Jim Johnessee, BWCT
Rohit Karamchandani, SAIC
Janna Unterzuber, SAIC
Janice Brown, SAIC
Jim McGlynn, SAIC

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

- (1) Clarification of the three stage preparation of the *Technical Peer Review Report* (sec. 2.7, p. 7);
- (2) Introduction of the Type IV Review applicable to the technical evaluation of competing submissions (sec. 3.1, p. 10);
- (3) Reinstatement of Type III Reviews to clarify that it should only be used for the review of technology projects that are either new starts or if they have reached a level of maturity such that a reasonably complete set of technical documentation is available (sec. 3.1, p. 11);
- (4) Application of the project screening process in the project selection for peer review, including the new peer review schedule that will be followed starting this fiscal year (sec. 3.2 and 3.3, p. 11-13);
- (5) Expansion and clarification of the Core Technical Criteria, allowing for an improved method for assessing the value of the technology development activity (sec. 3.4, p. 13-15);
- (6) Guide in the preparation of technology specific criteria (sec. 3.5, p. 16);
- (7) Expanded guidance in preparing the technical documentation, including definition on what does not qualify as publication in peer reviewed technical journal (sec. 3.7, p. 17);
- (8) Clarification in the format and submission requirement of the *DOE Response Report* (sec. 3.8, p. 17); and
- (9) Expansion and clarification of the roles and responsibilities allowing for a better understanding of everyone's expectations (sec. 4.0, p. 19-21).